1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 7 8 NGHIA V. NGUYEN, CASE NO. C19-cv-1054 RAJ Petitioner, 9 ORDER DISMISSING FEDERAL v. 10 **HABEAS ACTION** WASHINGTON STATE, 11 Respondent. 12 13 The Court has reviewed Petitioner's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition, the Report and 14 Recommendation of the Honorable Brian A. Tsuchida, United States Magistrate Judge, 15 Petitioner's objection to the Report and Recommendation, and the remaining record. The Court concurs fully in the recommendations of the Report and Recommendation. 16 Petitioner's objection is largely a recitation of the same arguments that were considered 17 and rejected by Judge Tsuchida in his well-reasoned R&R. Petitioner admits that he has not 18 exhausted his state remedies but argues that his petition is an "exception" because his 19 constitutional rights are being violated. Dkt. # 8 at 3-5. This argument is without merit. As 20 noted in Judge Tsuchida's R&R, "a state prisoner's federal habeas petition should be dismissed if 21 the prisoner has not exhausted available state remedies as to any of his federal claims." Coleman 22 v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722, 731 (1991). "This exhaustion requirement is also grounded in principles of comity; in a federal system, the States should have the first opportunity to address 23 and correct alleged violations of state prisoner's federal rights." Id. Because Petitioner has failed to exhaust his state court remedies, the Court lacks jurisdiction to review his federal habeas

ORDER DISMISSING FEDERAL HABEAS

ACTION - 1